

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed January 13, 2004, has been received and carefully reviewed in light of the Examiner's helpful comments and suggestions.

As a result of the Office Action, claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 1 has been amended to better define the claimed invention and to address the Section 112, second paragraph, indefiniteness rejection.

It is noted that the preliminary shearing of the side member 1 at a first depth (d) followed by a secondary shearing of the side member 1 at a second depth (D), wherein the first depth (d) is shorter than the second depth (D), to create the bar notch 3 having a bottom surface 5 and oblique sides 6 will prevent the fraying of the bottom surface 5 and oblique sides 6. If the bar notch were to be created by a single shearing procedure, then the sides 5 and 6 would be frayed and after-treatment of the bar notch would be required. Such after-treatment would alter the dimensions of the bar notch and therefore a perfect fit with the cross member notch would not be provided. Similar problems are avoided in creating the cross member notch 4 using a preliminary shearing at a first depth (d) followed by a secondary shearing at a second depth (D) of the cross member 2. Therefore, the bar notch 3 and cross member notch 4 are created with a two-step shearing process to avoid any after-treatment requirement, which would alter the desired dimensions of the bar and the cross member

notches.

Each issue raised in the Office Action mailed January 14, 2004, has been addressed and it is believed that claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. Wherefore, Applicant respectfully requests a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
DENNISON, SCHULTZ,
DOUGHERTY & MACDONALD

By: 

Amir H. Behnia
Reg. No. 50,215
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 16